

Papers and Abstracts in English

Tsukasa Kuwabara and Maki Aburada, 2011ab, Introduction to a Sociological Perspective of Symbolic Interactionism: Corrected Edition [<http://hdl.handle.net/10232/11060>] [<http://hdl.handle.net/10232/11867>] .

The main purpose of this study is to examine the theory of Symbolic Interactionism formulated by Herbert Blumer, from the following viewpoints:

- a) How does Symbolic Interactionism explain the concept of socialization, i.e., the process in which hominids become human beings?
- b) How does Symbolic Interactionism explain the concept of *Vergesellschaftung* (Simmel, G.), i.e., the process or mechanism through which people construct human society?
- c) Why is human society to be considered to be a changeable process?

After careful examination, the following findings were made:

- i) Blumer regards socialization as the process in which the two frameworks or perspectives (schemes of definition and generalized roles) that have been acquired by an actor through interactions with groups of others guide his/her interpretations/definitions.
- ii) In Blumer's theory, society is seen to be possible only when each of the actors in interactions can properly grasp the two standpoints (that of the other and one's own standpoint in the eyes of the other) by doing a kind of self-interaction (i.e., taking into account of taking into account; the concept taking into account of taking into account is the famous terminology used by N. Luhmann, but it was originally formulated by Blumer himself in 1953).
- iii) Because of the nature of others (black boxness), all the actors interacting with others are seen to be necessarily forced to revise their interpretations/definitions continually. For this reason, society must be regarded as a changeable process.

Finally, we have tried to review critically the research method of Symbolic Interactionism (i.e., the approach from the standpoint of the actor) on the basis of the conception of man and society that has been clarified in the earlier chapters of this paper. Our review provides evidence for the two additional points listed below:

- iv) in doing the approach from the standpoint of the actor, only an individual can be included into the category of the acting unit.
- v) the standpoint of the actor perceived by researchers must never be seen as *the standpoint in the raw* but has to be seen as a kind of *reconstruction of constructions* created by researchers.

We finally have confirmed that testing this conception of man and society (i, ii, and iii noted above) empirically, based on the points iv and v, would (and must) be one of our important tasks in future. In addition, this paper is the 'corrected' edition of the next article: Tsukasa Kuwabara, 2001, Introduction to a sociological perspective of Symbolic Interactionism (3)(The Summary of a doctoral dissertation, Tohoku University) *KEIZAIGAKU-RONSHU~ OF KAGOSHIMA UNIVERSITY*, 54.

Tsukasa Kuwabara and Ayaka Kihara, 2010, The Potential of Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism [<http://hdl.handle.net/10232/8983>] .

Since 1960s, Symbolic Interactionism (SI) has come to the forefront as an alternative sociological and social psychological perspective not only in American Sociology, but also in Sociology of the world. In the beginning, many scholars in the field drew fundamental ideas mainly and approvingly from Blumer's works, especially, from his 'three premises.' However 1970s and 1980s have brought many criticisms of the perspective. Therefore, SI needed to reconsider and re-develop its perspective and method in response to the criticisms. Among those criticisms, two of those have become common and popular as the labels characterizing both Blumer's SI and SI as a whole. That is, on the one hand, SI has been seen as one of the subjectivist theories, and on the other hand, it has been called micro-sociology by its very nature. In sum, there are four challenges facing Blumer's SI: i) theorizing the influences of social structures on self-interaction; ii) theorizing the influences of self-interaction on social structures; iii) theorizing the social structure itself; and iv) consideration of the 'approach from "the positions of the actors"' in relationship to the macro-sociological version of SI's perspective. The main purpose of this paper is to examine Blumer's SI and to show the way in which his perspective (and method) should be reconsidered.

Tsukasa Kuwabara and Ken'ichi Yamaguchi, 2007, An Introduction to the Sociological Perspective of Symbolic Interactionism: Herbert Blumer's Perspective Revisited, *Journal of Economics and Sociology, Kagoshima University*, 67: 1-9.

<http://megalodon.jp/2011-0827-1253-40/liveweb.archive.org/http://space.geocities.jp/issn03890104no54/DP/kuwabara-and-Yamaguch-2007.htm>
<http://hdl.handle.net/10232/6924>

Tsukasa Kuwabara, 2006, The Essence of Symbolic Interactionism: The Material Edition, *Discussion Papers in Economics and Sociology*, 0601: 1-12.

<http://warp.da.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1195815/ecowww.leh.kagoshima-u.ac.jp/staff/kuwabara/20100918/2006-02.jpg>
<http://gyo.tc/I8Dp>

Tsukasa Kuwabara, 2002, The first and second generations of the Chicago School of Sociology and Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism as their successor, *Discussion Papers In Economics and Sociology*, 0203: 1-8.

The Chicago School of Symbolic Interactionism (one trend of the "Chicago Renaissance") represented by the works of Herbert Blumer,

has been seen to be major alternative to functionalism and social system theory in American Sociology. In addition, this approach also has been important in sociology as a critique of positivism. Furthermore, according to T. Shibutani, "it is too early for a final assessment of Blumer's work. That will have to wait until the twenty-first century, when future historians will be able to see what remains of current Sociology. It seems likely that many of his view will prevail." So far, We have done many reviewing about Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism. The results which could be gotten as the result are summarized in the following paper: Tsukasa Kuwabara, 2001, "Introduction to a sociological perspective of Symbolic Interactionism(3) (The Summary of a doctoral dissertation, Tohoku University), " *KEIZAIGAKU-RONSHU- OF KAGOSHIMA UNIVERSITY* (ISSN=0389-0104) , No.54, The Economic Society of Kagoshima University, pp.69-86. In this article, we are trying to clarify the aspects which compose the reason why Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism is generally categorized as one trend of the "Chicago Renaissance".

Naoki Yoshihara, Tatsumi Naitou, Tsukasa Kuwabara, Raphaella D. Dwianto, Ayami Saitou, Tetsu Sueyoshi and Atsushi Takeda, 1999, *Study on Volunteer Fire Corps (Sho~bo~dan) and Its Role in the Process of Community Building for Disaster Prevention: The Case of Sendai City* (Abstract in English), Dai ichi Jyuutaku Kensetsu Kyokai.

<http://gyo.tc/HDgB>

Tsukasa Kuwabara, 1998, "Taking into account of taking into account" and the Exchanging of Information: Communication from the Standpoint of Symbolic Interactionism Reconsidered, *The Annual Report of the Tohoku Sociological Society*, 27: 149-66.

In studying communication among people from the standpoint of Symbolic Interactionism, we must attach much importance to the concept "self interaction," and in order to do so, we must avoid using a kind of hypodermic model as the method of theorizing the communication. In this article, we are trying to find out a Symbolic Interactionist perspective/conception of communication which keeps the two premises as above. The conception of communication we have found out is that communication is a process of interaction in which people are trying to grasp "perspective of the other" and "one's own perspective in the eyes of the other" through doing "taking into account of taking into account", a form of "self interaction," with each other.

Tsukasa Kuwabara, 1997, The conception of society in Herbert Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism Reconsidered, *Culture*, 60(3/4): 55-72.

The Chicago School of Symbolic Interactionism (one trend of the "Chicago Renaissance") represented by the works of Herbert Blumer, has been seen to be major alternative to functionalism and social system theory in American Sociology. In addition, this approach also has been important in sociology as a critique of positivism.

According to Blumer, from the standpoint of Symbolic Interactionism, the "human society" has to be recognized as "dynamic" by nature. By the way, what's the "human society" in his theory? To summarize his theory about this, it can be said as follows.

In a dyadic model of the actor and the other, both these two persons take each other into account. Taking another person into account means perceiving, defining and judging the other person and his/her action through "self interaction." The fact that each of the two persons is taking the other into account is notable. For, it means that each two persons are brought into a relation of subject to subject and necessarily have to do "taking into account of taking into account." According to Blumer, this "taking into account of taking into account" intertwines the actions of both into what he calls "joint action" which is grasped as constituting "human society" in his theory. Then, "human society" in his theory means the associations of various "joint actions."

In this article, we try to clarify the reason why the "human society" has to be recognized as dynamic by nature in Blumer's theory. In particular, Try to do this in close relation to his concept "self interaction."

Tsukasa Kuwabara, 1996, Herbert Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism Reconsidered, *The Annual Reports of the Tohoku Sociological Society*, 25: 81-101.

According to J.D.Lewis, Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism has sustained conception of the autonomous individual who functions in society while never becoming a product of it. In this article, we tried to get beyond this criticism. And in doing so, we focused on Blumer's concept "taking back."

According to Blumer, an actor has to fit one's action to one's environment and other's action. And in defining one's environment and other's action, the actor is guided by two schemes of definition, i.e., "schemes of definition" and "generalized roles" which the actor has got from one's "others" (then, the actor necessarily has to be socialized to adapt to the world.). And in his theory, the environment or "world of reality out there" including "others" are described as being able to "talk back" to the actor.

As we have seen, it can be said that Lewis has been inaccurate in the way he has described Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism.